



REGIONAL CATASTROPHIC PREPAREDNESS GRANT PROGRAM (RCPGP)

MID-TERM REVIEW CHECKLIST AND INSTRUCTIONS

March 2008



U.S. Department of
Homeland Security

RCPGP BACKGROUND

The Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPGP) is intended to enhance regional catastrophic preparedness and continuity of operations efforts, with the aim of strengthening the Nation against risks associated with catastrophic events. The RCPGP centers on the highest risk Urban Areas and surrounding regions, where its impact will have the most significant effect on our collective security and resilience. Each site eligible for participation in the RCPGP, designated as the RCPGP site, includes a collection of jurisdictions that must work collaboratively to fulfill the program requirements.

The RCPGP initiative is provided in response to the direction by Congress to develop “all-hazard regional catastrophic event plans and preparedness” for UASI urban areas and participating governments. The goal of this program is to allow jurisdictions to determine how to improve their security and resilience through a process best described as “*Fix, Build, and Resource*” – that is, *fix* shortcomings in existing plans; *build* regional planning processes and planning communities; and, link operational needs identified in plans to *resource* allocation, including homeland security grant programs.

DOCUMENT TITLE: MID-TERM REVIEW CHECKLIST AND INSTRUCTIONS

PURPOSE AND AUDIENCE

This document contains the instructions and checklist for the RCPGP Mid-term Review, to be completed by the Federal Preparedness Coordinator during the week of April 7, 2008.

CONTENT

Key topics covered in this document include:

- Mid-term Review Checklist Instructions
- Mid-term Review Checklist
 - Section I: Applicant and Reviewer Information
 - Section II: Investment Justification Review
 - Section III: Project Review

MID-TERM REVIEW CHECKLIST INSTRUCTIONS

The Mid-term Review checklist is to be completed during the week of April 7, 2008. While this review is the responsibility of the Federal Preparedness Coordinator (FPC), the FPC may request that the Deputy FPC or Program Analysis and Planning Officer (PAPO) conduct this review on his or her behalf. The completed Mid-term Review checklists must be returned to FEMA NPD HQ by COB April 11, 2008. FEMA NPD HQ will return all Mid-term Review checklists to the appropriate RCPTs by COB April 16, 2008.

This checklist should be completed once for the non-competitive investment justification and once for the competitive investment justification, if applicable.

The Mid-term Review checklist consists of three sections. An overview of each section and instructions for completion can be found below.

Applicant and Reviewer Information

This section includes the RCPGP site name, reviewer/FPC name, and reviewer contact information. Complete this section by entering the requested information in the grey boxes provided.

Investment Justification Review

This section includes a set of overarching criteria focused on the entire application, as well as specific criteria focused on information contained in the overview, background, and hazard analysis/risk identification sections of the investment justification submissions. Complete this section by entering “yes”, “no”, or “N/A” in the grey “Criteria Met?” column for each criteria. For each criteria not met, please provide a brief explanation in the comments section.

Project Review (to be completed for each project)

This section includes criteria focused on the project plans provided in sections 4 and 5 of the investment justification. This section should be completed once for each project submitted as part of the investment justification. Complete this section by entering “yes”, “no”, or “N/A” in the grey “Criteria Met?” column for each criteria. For each criteria not met, please provide a brief explanation in the comments section.

The checklist includes one Project Review section, which will need to be duplicated to accommodate the number of projects included in the investment justification. Instructions for how to duplicate this section, prior to completion, can be found below.

Copy and Paste Instructions for Project Review Section:

To duplicate the Project Review section, use the following steps as many times as necessary to create the required number of Project Review sections for each project submitted in the investment justification:

- Click on the page BELOW the Project Review table
- Select the “Insert” menu from the top navigation bar
- Select “Break” from the “Insert” menu
- Ensure “Page Break” is selected from the list and Click “OK”
(this will insert a blank page after the existing page)
- Highlight the Project Review section of the checklist
- Select “Ctrl+C” on your keyboard to copy the table (or right click and select “Copy”)
- Click on the top of the new blank page
- Press “Ctrl+V” on your keyboard to paste the section
(this will create a duplicate Project Review section on the new page)

SECTION I: APPLICANT AND REVIEWER INFORMATION

Instructions: Complete the following section by entering your RCPGP site name and reviewer information in the grey boxes provided below.

1. RCPGP Site Name	
2. Reviewer/FPC Name	
3. Reviewer Contact Information	
a. E-mail address	
b. Phone number	

SECTION II: INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION REVIEW

Instructions: Complete the following section by entering “yes”, “no”, or “N/A” in the grey “Criteria Met?” column for each criteria listed. For each criteria not met, please provide a brief explanation in the comments section on the following page. Put an “X” next to the investment type below.

Non-Competitive IJ		Competitive IJ	
Criteria Met?	Criteria		
	1. The IJ addresses the 3 objectives of the grant program: 1: fixing shortcomings in existing plans; 2: building regional planning processes and planning communities; and, 3: linking operational and capabilities-based planning resource allocation.		
	2. <u>Competitive IJ ONLY:</u> The IJ clearly explains why the additional funding beyond the base funding would be beneficial to the site.		
	3. The IJ demonstrates that there is a solid governance structure in place to implement the proposed projects within the 24 month grant period.		
	4. <u>IF the geographic area was altered from the RCPGP site designated in the original guidance:</u> the site submitted the site modification request to FEMA NPD HQ in writing and received approval.		
	5. <u>IF the geographic area was altered from the RCPGP site designated in the original guidance:</u> the changes to the site footprint are explained in the IJ.		
	6. The RCPT Overview section of the IJ clearly defines the lines of authority, voting rights, and reporting structure of the RCPT.		
	7. The scenarios selected clearly align with the site’s key risks.		
	8. All scenarios selected are clearly linked to at least one proposed project.		
	9. The Hazard Analysis Details section of the IJ clearly describes the site’s need for improved catastrophic emergency preparedness planning and its relationship to the priority planning requirements listed on page 4 of the RCPGP Guidance and Application Kit..		
	10. The Hazard Analysis Details section of the IJ clearly demonstrates how hazard mitigation plans and findings from previously conducted threat and/or vulnerability assessments support the priorities selected from the list on page 4 of the RCPGP Guidance and Application Kit..		

Investment Justification Review Comments:

Instructions: Please provide a brief explanation for any criteria not met.

SECTION III: PROJECT REVIEW

Instructions: Complete the following section by entering “yes”, “no”, or “N/A” in the grey “Criteria Met?” column for each criteria listed. For each criteria not met, please provide a brief explanation in the comments section on the following page. Enter the Project Title in the grey box below the instructions section.

This section must be completed once for each project included in the investment justification:
Prior to completion, duplicate this section as many times as necessary using the instructions provided on page 2.

Project Title:	
Criteria Met?	Criteria
	1. The project aligns with the scope of the program (planning for catastrophic incidents).
	2. The project clearly aligns with one or more of the risks and scenarios selected in the Hazard Analysis/Risk Identification section of the IJ.
	3. The applicant clearly articulates how the project, when combined with existing efforts, improves the RCPGP site’s catastrophic incident preparedness for all threats and hazards.
	4. The applicant clearly describes how the activities will be coordinated with all relevant entities (relevant State, local, regional, and Tribal authorities, private sector representatives, critical infrastructure owners and operators, and Citizen Corps Council representatives).
	5. The applicant includes enough milestones for the project to gauge whether or not the project is proceeding as planned at major intervals.
	6. The project challenges identified in the IJ are comprehensive.
	7. The risk management strategies for the project challenges identified in the IJ are appropriate.
	8. The projected impact to the success of the project for each challenge identified is accurate.
	9. The roles and responsibilities of the project management team are clearly articulated.
	10. The governance structure of the project management team is clearly articulated.

Project Review Comments:

Instructions: Please provide a brief explanation for any criteria not met.